

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above-identified application in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

Status of the Claims

Claims 1-25 are pending. Claims 1-15, 17-20 and 22-25 have been rejected and claims 16 and 21 have been objected to as including allowable subject matter but depending from a rejected base claim. Claims 1-25 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer and new claims 26-47 are added. No new matter has been introduced.

Information Disclosure Statement

Applicant concurrently files an Information Disclosure Statement to make references that were cited in an official communication received in a foreign counterpart application of record in this case. Applicant requests that the Examiner confirm consideration of the cited reference by initialing and returning the PTO-1449 provided.

Claim Objections and Rejections

Claims 1-15, 17-20 and 22-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication US 2001/0033418 A1 to Hayashi ("Hayashi"). Claims 16 and 21 were objected to as being drawn to allowable subject matter but being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the characterization of the cited references and the claims stated in the above rejections and believe that the claims as pending are patentably distinct from the art of record. Applicant respectfully traverses the stated rejections. Applicant has chosen in the interest of expediting prosecution to present alternate claim recitations and in conjunction therewith illustrate patentable distinctions over the art of record. Accordingly,

claims 1-25 are herein canceled without prejudice or disclaimer and new claims 26-47 are added. The rejections to claims 1-25 are thus rendered moot and their withdrawal is respectfully requested.

New Claims 26-47

Applicant herein presents claims 26-47 for examination on the merits. These claims, which include independent claims 26, 37 and 45, are believed to be patentably distinct over the art of record in this case for at least the following reasons.

Hayashi discloses that the reflector 2 reflects light flux emitted from the light source 1. The width of light flux emitted from a prism unit 3 is about twice the width of light flux entering the prism unit 3 only in a plane of Fig. 2. On the other hand, the width of the light flux reflected by the reflector 2 is not changed in a plane of Fig. 3 and this light flux is guided to the display panel 9.

Herein, the planes of Figs. 2 and 3 of Hayashi correspond to a first plane and a second plane as recited in independent claims 26, 37 and 45 of the present invention.

Referring to Fig. 2 of Hayashi, the width of light flux emitted from the prism unit 3 becomes about half the width at a pupil position of the illumination optical system, that is, a position where a second lens array 6 is arranged or a position where an image of the light source is formed. In other words, at the pupil position of illumination optical system (i.e., the position where the image of the light source is formed), the width of light flux in the plane of Fig. 2 is about the same value as the width of light flux in the plane of Fig. 3.

Herein, light intensity distribution representing the relationship between the incident angle and the light intensity on the illumination surface (display panel 9) is determined by the width of light flux at the pupil position of the illumination optical system.

Therefore, in light intensity distribution of Hayashi, the ratio of angle widths is an aspect ratio of 1:1. In other words, the angle width at which the light intensity reaches half of a peak value in the first plane is the same as angle width at which the light intensity reaches half of a peak value in the second plane.

The present invention is thus different from Hayashi in at least the foregoing regard.

Applicant believes the independent claims, and consequently the claims dependent therefrom, are not disclosed in nor suggested by, and thus neither anticipated by nor rendered obvious in view of, Hayashi, taken individually or in combination with other art of record, and Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims are patentably distinct from and allowable over such prior art for at least the foregoing reasons.

Applicant has not independently addressed the bases for allowance of the dependent claims because Applicant submits that, in view of the foregoing, the dependent claims are in condition for allowance for at least similar reasons as the independent claims from which they depend. Applicant however, reserves the right to address any individual rejections of the dependent claims should such be necessary or appropriate.

CONCLUSION

For the above-stated reasons, this application is respectfully asserted to be in condition for allowance. An early and favorable examination on the merits is requested.

While the petitioned extension of time is believed sufficient, should an additional extension be necessary to render this filing timely, such is hereby petitioned and the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees that may be required for this paper, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 13-4500, Order No. 1232-5279.


• • • • Appl. No. 10/774,812
Reply to Office Action dated May 16, 2005

In the event that a telephone conference would facilitate prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the number provided.

Respectfully submitted,
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.

Dated: October 17, 2005

By:


Stephen J. Manetta
Registration No. 40,426

Correspondence Address:

MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.
3 World Financial Center
New York, NY 10281-2101
(212) 415-8700 Telephone
(212) 415-8701 Facsimile